



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,574	11/12/2003	Steven Porter	10.1047	8259

21919 7590 04/21/2006

MEREK, BLACKMON & VOORHEES, LLC
673 S. WASHINGTON ST.
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SWERDLOW, DANIEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2615

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/713,574

Applicant(s)

PORTER, STEVEN

Examiner

Daniel Swerdlow

Art Unit

2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. **Claims 1 through 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rovnyak (US Patent 4,166,930) in view of Holmes et al. (US Patent 3,941,939).**
3. Regarding Claim 1, Rovnyak discloses a ring relay circuit that selectively switches between a ringing voltage supply (Fig., reference 200) and a battery supply (i.e., two different voltage supplies) to supply a RING node that corresponds to the common node claimed with the ringing voltage supply coupled to the RING (i.e., common) node via a set of relay contacts (Fig., reference 23, 27) that correspond to the first switch claimed and the battery via a set of relay contacts (Fig., reference 21, 24) that correspond to the second switch claimed. Rovnyak further discloses a ring trip loop sensor (Fig., reference 80) coupled to the common node that output a ring trip detection (i.e., feedback) signal. Rovnyak further discloses a CPU (Fig., reference 10; column 2, lines 46-48) that corresponds to the timing controller claimed and operates the relay coil (Fig., reference 20) that corresponds to the switch controllers claimed in response to the signal that corresponds to the feedback signal claimed from ring trip loop sensor (column 3, lines 14-18). However, Rovnyak is silent as to the structure of the ring trip loop sensor and, as such, does not disclose filtering a signal at the common node for producing the feedback signal. Holmes discloses a ring trip circuit that includes a high pass filter (Fig. 1, reference C2; column 2, lines 44-47) to produce a ring trip detection (i.e., feedback signal). Holmes further discloses that such an arrangement provides sensitive detection over a wide range of ringing frequencies

Art Unit: 2615

(column 1, lines 34-39). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply the filtering and detecting ring trip detector taught by Holmes to the relay circuit taught by Rovnyak for the purpose of realizing the aforesaid advantages.

4. Regarding Claim 2, Rovnyak further discloses a ringing voltage (i.e., alternating current) supply (Fig., reference 200) and a battery (i.e., direct current) supply (column 2, lines 31-33).

5. Regarding Claim 3, Rovnyak further discloses the CPU that corresponds to the timing controller claimed coupled to the ringing (i.e., AC) supply via the ring trip loop sensor (Fig., reference 80) and the relay contacts (Fig., reference 23, 27).

6. Regarding Claim 4, Rovnyak further discloses the CPU that corresponds to the timing controller claimed coupled to the battery (i.e., DC) supply and the common node via the ring trip loop sensor (Fig., reference 80) and the relay contacts (Fig., reference 23, 27).

7. Regarding Claim 7, Rovnyak discloses a ring relay circuit that selectively switches between a ringing voltage supply (Fig., reference 200) and a battery supply (i.e., two different voltage supplies) to supply a RING node that corresponds to the common node claimed with the ringing voltage supply coupled to the RING (i.e., common) node via a set of relay contacts (Fig., reference 23, 27) that correspond to the first switch claimed and the battery via a set of relay contacts (Fig., reference 21, 24) that correspond to the second switch claimed. Rovnyak further discloses a central processing unit (Fig., reference 10; column 2, lines 46-48) that determines the phone is to be rung and operates the relay (i.e., receiving a request to switch between the voltage supplies). Rovnyak further discloses staged switching involving use of current limiting resistors (Fig., reference 30, 40; column 2, lines 46-62) to provide an intermediate state of conductivity between the contacts being open and closed (i.e., gradually removing one of said voltage

Art Unit: 2615

supplies and gradually applying an other). Rovnyak further discloses a ring trip loop sensor (Fig., reference 80) coupled to the common node. However, Rovnyak is silent as to the structure of the ring trip loop sensor and, as such, does not disclose filtering a signal at a common node for detecting noise. Holmes discloses a ring trip circuit that filters ringing current (Fig. 1, reference R12, C2; column 2, lines 44-47) and shunts away (i.e., detects) unwanted AC signals (i.e., noise). Holmes further discloses that such an arrangement provides sensitive detection over a wide range of ringing frequencies (column 1, lines 34-39). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply the filtering and detecting ring trip detector taught by Holmes to the relay circuit taught by Rovnyak for the purpose of realizing the aforesaid advantages.

8. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rovnyak in view of Holmes and further in view of admitted prior art.

9. Regarding Claim 5, as shown above apropos of Claim 3, the combination of Rovnyak and Holmes makes obvious all elements except the switch comprising two serially coupled transistors. Applicant discloses as prior art the use of serially coupled transistors to switch a subscriber loop to a voltage supply (Fig. 1, reference First Mosfet, Second Mosfet). The advantages of using transistors in place of relay contacts were well known to one skilled in the art and include reductions in size and cost and improvements in reliability. As such, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply the serial transistors admitted by applicant as prior art to the combination made obvious by Rovnyak and Holmes for the purpose of realizing the aforesaid advantages.

Art Unit: 2615

10. Regarding Claim 6, as shown above apropos of Claim 3, the combination of Rovnyak and Holmes makes obvious all elements except the switch comprising two serially coupled transistors. Applicant discloses as prior art the use of serially coupled transistors to switch a subscriber loop to a voltage supply (Fig. 1, reference First Mosfet, Second Mosfet). The advantages of using transistors in place of relay contacts were well known to one skilled in the art and include reductions in size and cost and improvements in reliability. As such, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply the serial transistors admitted by applicant as prior art to the combination made obvious by Rovnyak and Holmes for the purpose of realizing the aforesaid advantages.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 8 through 20 are allowable.
12. Applicant has rewritten Claim 8 in independent form incorporating all limitations of its base claim. As such, Claim 8 is allowable for reasons stated in the prior Office action.
13. Claims 9 through 20 are allowable due to dependence from Claim 8.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed 21 February 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
15. In the second paragraph on page 11 of the response filed 21 February 2006, applicant alleges that the ring trip loop detector disclosed in Rovnyak fails to correspond to the feedback network claimed in Claim 1. Examiner respectfully disagrees. To one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2615

art, the function of the ring trip loop detector depicted in the figure in Rovnyak is clear. The ring trip loop detector detects the called subscriber station going off hook and signals this event to the CPU (10) so that the switching process from ringing supply to DC feed supply can be initiated by the CPU (column 3, lines 14-18). As such, the ring trip loop detector corresponds to the feedback circuit claimed and the signal it provides to the CPU corresponds to the feedback signal claimed. Applicant further alleges that “feedback controlled operation [is] detrimental to the desired make-before-brake effect” in Rovnyak. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown above, the feedback provided by the ring trip loop detector detects the called subscriber station going off hook and signals this event to the CPU (10) so that the switching process from ringing supply to DC feed supply can be initiated by the CPU (column 3, lines 14-18).

16. In the paragraph spanning pages 11 and 12 and the remaining paragraphs on page 12 of the response, applicant alleges that Holmes fails to disclose a high-pass filter as claimed in Claim 1. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As applicant admits, the structure cited in Holmes provides a path for AC current. As such, it is performing a high-pass filter function. The claim only requires that the feedback network include a high-pass filter among other elements, and does not specify any particular function for the high-pass filter.

17. Applicant’s remaining arguments, made on page 13 of the response are limited to similarities and dependences of other claims relative to Claim 1 and are unpersuasive for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

18. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Swerdlow whose telephone number is 571-272-7531. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday between 7:30 AM and 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh H. Tran can be reached on 571-272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2615

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Daniel Swerdlow
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2615

ds
18 April 2006